TOURISM POLICY

Noel Scott

Griffith Institute for Tourism, Griffith University, Australia

INTRODUCTION

The study of government policy seeks to understand how policy decisions are created, the information, interests and values involved in policy processes and what their impacts are (Hall, 2008). Tourism policy is an important area for study because of its practical and theoretical importance. Tourism policy studies of **practical significance** to government may be in relation to bilateral airline negotiations (Elliott, 1997), decisions about provision of facilities and services and land use planning (Kerr, 2003), interactions with other economic sectors such as agriculture and mining, publicly 'owned' resources such as national parks as attractions, the issuing of tourist visas and in the funding of destination marketing (Ahmed & Krohn, 1990). Government develops policy to address market failure in destination marketing (Smeral, 1998) and to mitigate the cultural, social and environmental effects of tourism (Kerr, 2003). Governments control the amount of paid holidays (York & Zhang, 2010), currency movements (Wanhill, 1987), international affairs, border security, and social and community development. Governments policy in areas such as agriculture (Leslie & Black, 2005; Williams & Ferguson, 2005), security (Blake & Sinclair, 2003), and health (Zeng, Carter, & De Lacy, 2005) can have a profound effect on tourism flows. This government involvement is pervasive and is at national, provincial and local levels (Kerr, 2003) requiring center and region to coordinate their policies (OECD, 2012). Tourism provides around 10% of the world's economy on average but varies in its impact in particular countries with consequent effects on the communities and natural environments with which it interacts.

Tourism is an open system where the potential for collateral impact and damage from external shocks, crises and disasters is significant (B. Ritchie, Crotts, Zehrer, & Volsky, 2014). Despite the pervasive government involvement in tourism, it is only recently that formally stated and publicly accessible national tourism policies have become common (Bhanugopan, 2001; Buhalis, 2001; Reid & Schwab, 2006). Tourism may be affected indirectly by government policy in a related area; or directly through active pursuit of a policy objective. In many countries, tourism policy is directed to achieving regional economic development (Harrison & Schipani, 2007).

Tourism policy, explicitly or implicitly involves beliefs and values, about what is good and bad, providing the basis for allocation of resources. However in many cases, the lack of a clear answer to the problem being addressed, has led such policy issues to be called 'wicked' problems (Rittel & Weber, 1973). An example from Eritrea is the trade-off between the 'social and ecological dangers posed by large-scale development', and a 'desperate need of foreign investment and the foreign exchange earnings some of which could be generated through tourism' (Burns, 1999, p. 343). This means that it is unlikely for there to be positive-sum outcomes for all participants resulting in 'winners and losers (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). Thus, policy development is seen as complex (McDonald, 2009), and may be best dealt with as a complex adaptive system (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2005).

Tourism also provides an interesting context in which theories developed in more traditional areas may be tested. Tourism provides a complex bundle of hedonic and mostly discretionary services, that is distinct from the agricultural, resource extraction, or manufacturing sectors that have traditionally been the focus of government economic policy. Operationally it involves an ill-defined heterogeneous set of stakeholders in often simultaneous cooperative and competitive behavior at both destination and global scales. These stakeholders include tourism operators, cooperative organizations, government bodies, networks of people and organizations, the community, non-government organizations, and so on. Therefore tourism policy may be a domain for examination of concepts such as trust, competition and collaboration, social identity, power; and viewed through disciplinary and ideological 'lenses', and at different levels (macro, meso, micro) of analysis (J. Jenkins, 2001).

Therefore we may discern an industry policy and academic policy literature. Tourism policy research may seek to provide advice to government, or it may see policy as the object of study. An industry perspective would look to change policy to secure a competitive edge in increasingly global consumer markets (J. R. B. Ritchie & Crouch). Bramwell and Lane (2006, p. 1) characterise this approach as 'distinctly positivist and empirical in outlook; it leaves the impression that it is dealing with objective, value-free or neutral knowledge'. The global expansion of tourism has provided need for policy advice and academics have recorded instances of policy in case studies leading to an unconsolidated literature dominated by 'policy led and industry sponsored work so the analysis tends to internalize industry led priorities and perspectives' (Franklin & Crang, 2001, p. 5).

This review of the academic tourism policy literature attempts to organize a 'diverse and

fragmented literature' (Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2006, p. 296) about which there is 'little agreement about how [it] should be studied and the reasons underpinning such studies' (Hall & Jenkins, 1995, p. 2). The paper builds on the work of Ambrosie (2010) who allocated categorized papers on a rational to social paradigm continuum, as well as the numerous books on 'tourism policy' and 'tourism policy and planning'. Other papers have reviewed a particular topic in a focused way such as urban tourism competitiveness policy (Connelly, 2007, p. 85). This paper analyses the literature using the concept of the policy cycle, ideology and values implicitly or explicitly adopted, level of policy and methodology.

THE LITERATURE OF TOURISM AND POLICY

Reviewing and integrating such an unconsolidated literature is a daunting task and studies of policy, planning, and analysis of tourism are difficult to delineate. Many journal articles include 'policy' in their list of keywords on the basis that their findings may be of interest to policymakers, and papers may discuss the policy implications of their work in the conclusions section. The inclusion or exclusion of papers that provide policy implications in a discussion that is otherwise about marketing, consumer behavior, economics, sociology, biology, and so on, may explain why there is disagreement over the size of the tourism policy literature. Some authors have argued that the tourism policy literature is limited (Ballantyne, Packer, & Axelsen, 2009), while a recent review using 'public' and 'policy' as search terms in a search of 18 journals over the period 1980-2007 has identified over 400 articles (Ambrosie, 2010). Indeed, based on the pervasive government involvement in tourism, and its interest in the impacts of tourism, it is arguable that all tourism research is policy research.

The concept of policy has no accepted definition (Airey & Chong, 2011). 'Policy' is derived from the word 'polis', denoting a city-state of ancient Greece, from which the terms 'politics', 'polity' and 'police' are also derived (Colebatch, 2009, p. 63). One way of defining policy is as a 'handle on the way we are governed, a concept which we use to make sense of what we do' (Colebatch, 2009, p. 63) or 'whatever governments choose to do or not to do' (Dye, 1992, p. 2). In this sense policy is a name to describe the general actions and outcomes of government. However, as governments are complex and produce many outcomes, such a definition may be considered summative only (Dubin, 1976), useful as an introduction to a complex phenomenon but which requires further elaboration.

Analysis of the definitions of policy used in the literature suggests that it involves some sort of

decision, either expressed through a process or an outcome. Thus policy is a 'web of decisions and actions that allocate values' (Easton, 1953, p. 128). Alternatively tourism policy includes government action, inaction, decisions, and non-decisions as these all imply a deliberate choice between alternatives (Richter, 1983). The notion that public policy involves choices about both whether to develop a policy and what type of policy choices need to be made suggests that developing public policy is a political activity, influenced by the characteristics of a particular society, the formal structures of government, and the local political system (Hall, 2000), and 'political debate about what the agenda is' (D. Dredge & Jenkins, 2007, p. 10). Extensive private sector involvement in tourism means this debate extends beyond government and includes national tourist organizations, consumer associations, pressure groups, hotels, restaurants, tour operators, travel agencies (Van Doorn, 1982, p. 155).

This leads to a study of tourism policy from the perspective of political economy (Britton, 1982; Elliott, 1997; Mosedale, 2011), where ideology affects tourism policy and the degree of development reached (Sessa, 1976). Swain (1999, p. 1008) suggests that the study of policy and power in tourism 'includes a broad range of concepts from ideology to exchange rates and visa control'. An increasingly important view associated with the ideology of neo-liberalism is that policy communities or networks of interested stakeholders play an important part in the development of issues and policy formulation processes. Thus policy and the policy process will change over time, and what is 'good' policy must be determined by argument not scientific information although science has an important role to play in policy development.

The rational approach to policy is therefore contrasted with policy as a social process (Lawrence & Dredge, 2007) involving communication (Stevenson, Airey, & Miller, 2008), and importantly that policy cannot be separated from implementation (Greenwood, Williams, & Shaw, 1990). The policy implementation process may also require a number of other steps such as administrative coordination and policy coordination (Elliott, 1997; Hall, 1999), and the exercise of power (Marzano & Scott, 2009). In summary then, there are a broad range of characteristics which identify policy. Policy involves actions, decision, politics, values and ideological beliefs, social processes involving communication, and outcome such as legislation and implementation.

One area of dispute in tourism is the extent to which policy and planning overlap and indeed much tourism policy development occurs in the context of the planning processes. Some authors separate planning from policy development, where planning … 'is a process

that occurs up to the point of decision making. Policy denotes the formal adoption of a position by government' (D. Dredge & Jenkins, 2007, p. 10), and is the basis of policymaking (Van Doorn, 1982). Other authors consider that the output of the policy process is an overall strategy for tourism development (J. R. B. Ritchie & Crouch, 2003) that presumably leads to development of a plan; and that policy may not be stated separately but must be inferred from plans developed, often at national level. Again, some consider policy and planning overlapping where policies are ongoing principles and broad goals while planning overlaps and 'is the process by which decisions are made as to the optimum way to implement policies and achieve goals' (Veal, 2002, p. 5). In the tourism literature policy is often considered different from politics and is the outcome of some political process (Altinay & Bowen, 2006). Thus politics has a formative impact on tourism policies (Matthews & Richter, 1991; Richter, 1983) but is a distinct process (Henderson, 2003). We may conclude that policy and planning overlap in tourism. This may be due to assumptions among governments that tourism will happen, and is a form of development that requires planning and implementation rather that serious ideological and political debate.

This section has highlighted the need for this review, some limitations of the literature relating to policy, the scope of this review, definitions of policy and how policy overlaps with planning and politics. In the next section, this review looks at the creation of public policy using an adopted similar to that of the policy cycle model as a structure. The policy cycle model is an analytical perspective which simplifies the tourism policymaking process by segregating it into formal stages (Pforr, 2001), typically agenda setting, formulation, decision making (grouped here as development of the aim), implementation, and evaluation. In addition the section will examine 'development' as one dominant aim of tourism policy.

CREATING PUBLIC POLICY

Many factors affect the development of policy. In this section we analyse policy firstly in terms of a government's aims or objectives and in particular tourism *development*. This is pervasive in the literature of tourism, and we find it in other terms, such as sustainable development, alternative development (Weaver, 1995), and so on. After discussing the concept of development, this review examines a range of other policy objectives found in the tourism literature.

Policy Aims, Objectives and Ideologies

Government policy objectives reflect its responsibilities and ideology. Objectives can be formal or informal, stated or unstated (Elliott, 1997). *Formal* objectives are normally consistent with the aims laid down in the national constitution or in the party policy documents or manifesto. The dominant *informal* objectives may be to achieve certain stakeholder aims, or simply to hold on to power and stay in office. Jenkins and Henry (1982, p. 501) describes government involvement in tourism as active; a deliberate action 'introduced to favour the tourism sector'; or *passive* 'an action which may have implications for tourism, but is not specifically intended to favour or influence tourism'. Traditionally, government involvement in tourism has largely been a product of wider policy aims such as the national balance of payments, or regional economic development targets (Kruczala, 1990; Smyth, 1986).

Early reasons for government involvement in developing countries in the post second world war period were development of foreign exchange earnings; foreign investment; employment in tourism; land use policies; and air transport and tourism (C. L. Jenkins & Henry, 1982). These objectives may be distinguished from the means of achieving these objectives; Richter and Richter (1985) list five *policy options* for South Asian countries (in 1985): public versus private tourism development; domestic versus international tourism; class versus mass tourism; centralization versus decentralization; and integrated versus enclave tourism.

A central theme in the literature concerns development of tourism as an instrument of economic development and as a tool developing countries - a focus of research in tourism studies since the 1970s (Hall, 2007). Numerous books and journal articles have examined tourism development (Aramberri & Butler, 2005; Burns & Novelli, 2008; Telfer & Sharpley, 2008), and papers (Bhanugopan, 2001; Gartner, 2004; Hall & Michael, 2007; Khadaroo & Seetanah, 2007; Lindberg, Andersson, Dellaert, & Dellaert, 2001; Nilsson, 2001; Puppim de Oliveira, 2003; Reid & Schwab, 2006; Rosentraub & Joo, 2009; Sharpley, 2009; Telfer, 2002; Tosun, 2001; Tsartas, 2003; Turegano, 2006; Wilkinson, 2001). Development theories 'consciously or unconsciously express a preferred notion of what development is and these preferences, in turn, reflect values' (Sharpley & Telfer, 2002, p. 13) and ideology.

Despite its centrality and importance however, the concept of development appears to defy definition (Whitford, 2009). In the early policy literature, tourism was seen uncritically as a form of economic development that sought to improve the living conditions of people (Tosun, 2001, p. 290). Wight (2002), in the context of sustainability, distinguishes between growth and development. Economic growth is an increase in quantity, while economic development is an improvement in the quality of life without necessarily causing an increase in quantity of resources consumed, but instead an increase in self-reliance (Lepp, 2008). Goldsworthy (1988) considers that development is usually considered a purely good outcome but in fact there is no likelihood of positive-sum outcomes with gains to all participants. Development involves policy choices and some stakeholders may benefit from it while others lose.

Early attempts at proactive development intervention were subject to criticism by dependency theory authors. Britton (1982, p. 334) defines dependency as 'involv[ing] the subordination of national economic autonomy to meet the interests of foreign pressure groups and privileged local classes rather than those development priorities arising from a broader political consensus'. It has been claimed that the outcome of the race to modernize results in internal elites and leads to concentration of power and dependency (Steiner, 2006), and the erosion of 'political and social autonomy' (Macnaught, 1982, p. 377). A more sophisticated view is that dependency results from the failure to improve the social and political institutions as modernization occurs (Dieke, 1993) and Turegano (2006) rejects dependency as inevitable in favour of path dependency.

Based on the 'failure' of early tourism in developing countries and the lessons learned, a number of other development theories evolved. Azcairate (2006) lists these as modernization, dependency theory, human development and post-development. Harrison and Schipani (2007) provide a historical sequence of the changes from 'simplistic models of modernization', to the reaction evident in dependency theory, to alternative tourism, the inclusion of social and environmental protection, and community based approaches (Hawkins & Mann, 2007). A similar sequence is found in the four platforms of Jafari (1989) - (advocacy, cautionary, adaptancy and knowledge based) that reflect ideological and policy changes (Swain et al., 1999). Weaver (2001) has summarised the relationship between tourism platforms, paradigm shifts, tourism structure and ecotourism status in Western societies.

Along with these successive changes in development paradigm, the focus of tourism policy has changed from pure promotion, to product development, to maintaining

competitiveness (Fayos-Sola, 1996). Most recently, post-development studies have understood development as a global discourse resisted by local 'Others' although this discourse may be considered a two way process mediated by powerful local actors (Azcairate, 2006). Each paradigm emphasises different aims and roles for tourism that represent 'the substance of policy' (Kerr, 2003). Each is connected with or emphasises functional roles for government such as: coordination, planning, legislation, entrepreneurial support, stimulation, promotion, social tourism, and public interest protection (Hall, 2000).

We may also characterize policy based on the problem it addresses. Tourism is a complex domain (Grant, 2004, p. 221) that touches upon a wide ranges of 'problem areas' such as aboriginal rights, aviation, biodiversity, disability and access, domestic tourism, events, health, innovation, knowledge and learning, development/land use, national parks, place identity, political legitimacy, regional development, rural tourism, safety/crisis management, training and human resources, recreation, urban development. Each of these numerous related domains is the subject of a specific literature and various policy prescriptions leading to a view of policy as 'an outcome' rather than 'a process' (Colebatch, 2009). From an outcome perspective each of the problem areas is subject to expert opinion on the best 'solution', a view that diminishes the political debate and ideological beliefs.

As discussed above, policies are influenced by ideological arguments about tourism, especially in developing states (Mathews, 1975), and it is important to understand the ideological basis for policy development in order to obtain insight into workings of government (Whitford, 2009). Many different ideological positions are available such as liberalism, social democracy, communism and mercantilism (O'Neil, 2007, p. 47). These differ in terms of the role of the state in the economy (i.e. liberalism: little involvement; minimal welfare state, social democracy some state ownership and regulation; large welfare state); the relative importance of the market; how policy is made, and the type of policies that are acceptable. In many countries one ideology may be dominant, and may vary over time. Tourism policy in Australia (Airey & Ruhanen, 2014) and New Zealand (Shone & Ali Memon, 2008) has increasingly been underpinned by a neo-liberalist ideology. Indeed, this ideology has been suggested as influencing development policy in provincial rural communities in Canada (Mair, 2006, p. 39) and in Peru (Desforges, 2000) and many other countries.

Neo-liberalism is 'a theory of political economic practices which proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an

institutional framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, free markets and free trade' (Harvey, 2006, p. 145). Duffy (2008, p. 329) considers it a 'process by which market-based regulation is expanded, the role of the state is reduced, and a complex array of public–private networks operate'. Neo-liberalism has been associated with the commodification of nature (Duffy, 2008) and emphasises deregulation and a strong interest in the concept of governance as will be discussed later in this paper.

Geographic Level of Policy

Tourism policy has been studied at a number of geographic levels ranging from global, multi-country national, regional, to local government and may be multi-level. Many of the issues that affect tourism transcend borders: Wheatcroft (1988) examined aviation policy in the expanded European Union. Globalization is a factor that has influenced the development of multi-country policy (Hannam, 2002; Hjalager, 2007; Sugiyarto, Blake, & Sinclair, 2003) and requires coordination across national boundaries. The development of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) is an example of how transnational policy and processes are affecting tourism (Edgell, 1995). Dredge has conducted a body of research on the subnational level in Australia, (2001). At the local authority level, policy making is often constrained by higher levels of government (Human, 1994). Tovar and Lockwood (2008) examines local attitudes to the effect of tourism on community in Tasmania. There is often also an interaction between levels of policy due to the need for collaborations between levels of government policy makers, such as Federal and State governments in Australia (D. Dredge & Jenkins, 2003). Greenwood (1990, pp. 55-56) argues that there may be "distortion of policy objectives as it passes through implementing agencies could be regarded, at a crude level of abstraction, as akin to a process of 'Chinese Whispers'". In the European Union, policy is needed at three levels, European Union, national and local that should be compatible with a degree of consultation if not cooperation, between the levels (Greenwood et al., 1990).

A 'whole-of-government' approach to tourism policy adopted in New Zealand is discussed by Zahra and Ryan (2005). In general this approach is difficult to implement as the broad inputs and effects of tourism policy leads to conflicts between government departments. Pearlman (1990) for example discusses macro-policy conflicts between social tourism subsidised by the state for domestic tourists and international tourism as well as difficulties with central planning of the economy. Richter (2003) notes that there is a lack of coordinated policy making in the area of health and tourism across countries. Pearce (1998)

discusses the development of tourism in Paris as significantly related to urban planning and policy. Tourism policy is often driven by a broad policy agenda and action in other spheres rather than particularly targeted at tourism (Church, Ball, Bull, & Tyler, 2000, p. 316). Tourism policy also may in turn affect other policy domains with Expo events policy affecting housing (Olds, 1998). It is also used to rationalise other interests, such as a desire amongst enthusiasts to see trams in Christchurch, New Zealand (Pearce, 2001).

Policy Making Process

The policy cycle approach examines the process of making policy, hence moving the focus from particular policy aims, ideology, outcomes, countries and levels of government, and towards recognition of the complexity of policymaking. Hall (2002) suggests that a five stage pattern of policy attention to emergent issues will be followed: pre-problem stage, alarmed discovery and euphoric enthusiasm, realisation of the cost of significant progress, gradual decline of intense public interest and the post-problem stage. However this can only be a first approach as it does not recognise the complexity of policy development. Instead policy making is a complex process of identification and attention; a "continuing iterative process" in which …..factors are interpreted and reinterpreted, thus further influencing the perceptions of policy makers (Weed, 2006, p. 238); and a 'process of issue identification and management where multiple issues are being simultaneously identified, framed, prioritised and de-prioritised' (Wray, 2009, p. 675).

Issues can be further influenced by events, personalities, pressures groups and institutional failure, as well as scale and time (Lawrence & Dredge, 2007). McCoy (1982, p. 277) considers 'public policy formulation is a process of conflict and compromise; a matter of mediating between competing factions with "private interests" and defining the "public interest" or the "national interest"' which Bramwell considers path dependent (2009). It is essentially a social process, involving communication and negotiation between people in the context of wider change (Stevenson et al., 2008). Thus there is general agreement that policy making is complex and more of an art that a science, involving communication, negotiation, interests and issue framing.

The issues considered in policy may be 'national' interests and important to all the population. Ritchie (1988) argues for consensus policy formulation in tourism through surveys of resident attitudes. However policy development is often considered as controlled by elites

(Yasarata, Altinay, Burns, & Okumus, 2010) or power blocs; with a dominance of dominance of close business-government ties (Craik, 1990; Hall, 1999). There has been increasing examination of the effectiveness of tourism policies in achieving their stated aim (Andriotis, 2001). Policy implementation can be considered part of the policy process, and requires the development of skills and competences (Henry & Jackson, 1996), and may involve vested interests (Thomas & Thomas, 1998). Barriers to implementation of sustainable tourism policy include; economic priority (short term economic focus wins over long term social and environmental concerns); lack of planning (too much damage was already done and initiatives were not strong enough to apply to already damaged areas); lack of stakeholder involvement; lack of integration with regional and national frameworks and policies; lack of accountability of politicians (lack of political will); and lack of coordination with other government parties (political clash) (Dodds, 2007). Dodds and Butler (2010) indicate that self-interest is a barrier to implementing sustainable tourism policies. Ioannides (1995, p. 591) found that to avoid a failure of sustainable policy implementation, it is important to maintain effective dialogue between communities and policy makers, and that one way to achieve this is through community visioning workshops whereby different interest groups in the host locality express their fears and aspirations. Means to avoiding conflict in tourism development may be grouped into three main categories: power-coercive; empirical-rational; and normative-educative (Prunier, Sweeney, & Geen, 1993). Backward mapping (Greenwood et al., 1990, p. 55) is another technique for policy implementation.

A policy output may be a statement on an issue, a non-decision, or the creation and use of an instrument. Logar (2010) discusses the effects of policy instruments for sustainable tourism on identified tourism impacts and issues in Crikvenica, Croatia. Policy outputs should be distinguished from policy outcomes, which may be unintended (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). There are a range of instruments to implement policy (Puppim de Oliveira, 2003) including government legislation, directives and guidance, fiscal and monetary measures, to the creation of special bodies (Airey, 1983); investment incentives (Ward, 1989, p. 241) and eco-taxes (Cantallops, 2004). Government intervention in tourism includes the regulation of tourist guiding in terms of licensing, certification, training, pay and benefits, marketing and conducting tours, and the organization and professional ethics of guides (Dahles, 2002). There may be as many 'instruments as there are targets of policy' (Kerr, 2003, p. 33). Another instrument is a non-decision (Reed, 1997, p. 572) where no decisions are taken

or necessary, as well as when conscious choices are made to do nothing, to thwart demands for change, or to adopt plans that are imperfectly implemented.

Governments and their critics have become more aware of and interested in the study of the process, outcomes, and impacts of tourism public policies. Deegan (2000) reviews successes of tourism in Ireland and considers there is a need to study the causal links between policy and performance. Baretje (1982) suggests that tourism's outcomes should be measured properly to ensure correct policy decisions. Hence, the evaluation of government decisions, actions, and programs, and therefore of tourism public policies, is receiving growing recognition (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). However, this may be difficult 'because of the influence of a number of other factors, chief among which are external issues such as the economic climate in the major source markets' (Chambers & Airey, 2001, p. 95). Odularu (2008) uses economic analysis to understand the outcomes of tourism in Africa. He concludes that economic performance in West Africa can be enhanced through sound tourism development policies that support economic openness with greater emphasis on liberalization policy. Bull (1990) evaluates different policies for foreign investment on Australia tourism.

Policy outcomes for various types of tourism have also been evaluated. Ecotourism has become an important means of tourism development, protected area management and community development. Its success is mixed however, and probably most successful as a political process (Buckley, 2009). While outcomes may be measured in terms of economic growth (Lee & Chang, 2008) other measures such as protection of public interest have also been discussed (D. Dredge & Thomas, 2009). Castellani and Sala (2010) have discussed measures of policy outcomes for sustainable performance.

Analysing Policy

The approaches to analyzing public policy have been grouped into four types; rational choice, socioeconomic, institutionalism and networks (John, 1998; Tyler & Dinan, 2001). The rational choice or scientific approach focuses on providing factual knowledge and analysis rather than an intrinsically political view, and in the same way, each approach is based on a particular view of the world and how it operates, and incorporates theories and concepts, but which may overlaps with other approaches.

A number of researchers claim that dominant approaches to understanding public policy have developed from the rational paradigm (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004; Kerr, Barron, & Wood, 2001; Pforr, 2005; Stevenson et al., 2008). Early tourism policy was developed at a time when no strong evidence base existed for the dilemmas caused by tourism or indeed any recognition that negatives existed. Tourism was seen as a source of development "The challenge facing tourism planners in Zambia is the optimum development of the industry ….." (Teye, 1988). Much criticism is done with the benefit of hindsight. Examples of a scientific approach include satellite accounts used for sustainable tourism policy development (Pham, Dwyer, & Spurr, 2009), CGE modelling for policy formulation (Dwyer, Forsyth, & Spurr, 2004), and public choice analysis as a model to analyse government policy decisions (O'Fallon, 1993), and to investigate calls for market intervention (Michael, 2001). Treuren and Lane (2003) discuss the difference between rational versus contingent planning. Araña (2013) has sought to ask tourists to valuation of climate change policy.

The scientific choice model has been used to analyse; the effect of state subsidization of small tourism businesses (Fleischer & Felsenstein, 2000), and policy alternatives for access to private land in Sweden (Mortazavi, 1997). Policy design is an associated term and is used by Blake and Sinclair (2003) for analyzing the effect of September 11. A similar approach is taken by Sugiyarto, Blake and Sinclair (2003) in looking at the effects of globalization on Indonesia. Cohen (1988) adopts a rational approach to the study of policy dilemmas posed by AIDS in Thailand, a major tourism destination with a developed sex industry. The use of rational models for policy design has been criticised due it ignoring politics (Tosun, 2001).

Critics claim that a scientific approach is 'reductionist, producing thin description that ignores the dynamics within the environment and have not provided the analytical tools to investigate context' (Stevenson et al., 2008, p. 733). Policies are subject to ideologies (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). The rational choice model is based on the concepts of personal choice and maximisation of individual benefits as basis of policy action or inaction (Tyler & Dinan, 2001). It appears that this approach provides inputs into policy development but does not analyse policy development and does not address the issue of politics and "win-lose'. An institutional approach focuses on the organizational powers, rules, investment incentives and constraints that influence policy development and implementation (Dieke, 1993; Sofield, 1993). The term institution refers to many different types of entities, as well as the rules used

to structure patterns of interaction within and across organisations (Kerr, 2003). This highlights that tourism is strongly influenced by (reliant on) government and therefore highly institutionalised, for example in examining public policy for tourism in Northern Island (Smyth, 1986, p. 126).

Institutional analysis considers that public policy is predominantly made within political and public institutions, and has been criticized for underplaying the political and social processes (Stevenson et al., 2008). Institutional approaches have been used by Dredge and Jenkins (2003) in studying Australia State – Federal relationships, and by Zahra (2005) discussing National Tourism Organizations. The development of policy and changes to their roles and responsibilities can have 'profound influences on the NTO and the development of the tourism industry in that country' (Zahra & Ryan, 2005, p. 22). Hannam (2004) studied the power relationships of Indian State organizations and how this affects tourism policy.

A number of theories are related to the institutional approach including regime theory (Russo & Segre, 2009), city/urban growth machine (Molotch, 1976), and regulation theory (Mair, 2006). The regime framework (Stone, 1989) considers that property regimes (institutions) affects tourism development options (Russo & Segre, 2009). Healy (1994, p. 59) describes 'three property rights regimes for managing such resources: privatization, management by government, and common property regimes'.

The urban growth machine theory developed by Molotch (1976) and the urban regime seek to understand 'the power and role of business interests in urban policy, and the emergence of coalitions involving business and other interests' (Church, 2004, p. 562). This theoretical framework discusses the idea of local groups that vie with each other as determining policy towards tourism in a city (Madrigal, 1995). Most recently, there has been renewed interest in institutions through the work of Ostrom's theory of collective action (Ostrom, 1990), and especially the design principles for robust management of common pool resources (Haase, Lamers, & Amelung, 2009). Community based tourism may be considered a form of institution theory as it examines the importance of addressing host community interests and involving host communities in public policy decision making (Thyne & Lawson, 2001). Murphy (1985) discusses involvement in community planning on the basis that the community should decide how tourism will be developed, as it may be an instrument for dispute between local people and central authority as in South America (Kent, 2006).

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and interest groups are other types of institutions that have been found to influence tourism policy (Lovelock, 2003). Lovelock (2003) discusses the tactics NGOs use to gain legitimacy such as media, advocacy and litigation. NGOs are also seen to be important stakeholders in policy development (Jamal & Getz, 1999; Kousis, 2000). In many countries the open nature of tourism leads to a number of interest groups that seek to 'contribute to public policy-making and implementation in the tourism domain' (Greenwood, 1992, p. 255). Interest groups are associated with client politics 'typical of policies with diffuse costs and concentrated benefits. An identifiable group benefits from a policy, but the costs are paid by everybody or at least a large part of society and that tourism policy is one such area' (Hall, 1999).

The application of ethics to policy can be considered as fitting into a number of perspectives but here is considered as exemplifying a particular type of shared value or institution. Early interest in ethics is embodied in a study of development of tourism (Lea, 1993). A broader interest in ethics has been stimulated by the need to implement sustainable development principles (Bramwell & Lane, 2008; Macbeth, 2005). Environmental ethics are an important requirement for policy (Holden, 2003) and need to be embedded in the market economy (Holden, 2009). Further Bramwell and Lane (2008, p. 1) argue that there is a move to focus on "just sustainability", and involve concerns about social justice. Corruption leads to a deterioration of social justice and is a failure of ethics (Church, 2004). It is argued that the legacy of uneven development, and the entrenched power of regional economic and political elites, is likely to undermine the prospects for a just model of sustainable tourism (Bianchi, 2004).

The social approach includes a focus on the arrangement, actions and interactions of individual people or organizations. 'Tourism policy-making is seen as a social activity with the focus being placed on examining how actors (institutions, groups, organizations, individuals) relate to each other, or on the factors that influence perceptions of policies' (Bramwell & Lane, 1999). Collaborative policy development may involve conflict resolution, problem solving and capacity building processes (Lovelock, 2001, 2002). Some authors have a more holistic approach and focus attention on the collaborative environment, the interaction between different initiatives, the networks and communications between the people involved in the process and the political nature of policy making (D. Dredge, 2006a; Laing, Lee, Moore, Wegner, & Weiler, 2009; Stevenson et al., 2008).

There is an evolving body of theory of collaboration and partnerships, along with criteria for assessing the effectiveness of collaborative projects and practical guides for their initiation and management. Collaboration involves a number of stakeholders working interactively on a common issue or ''problem domain'' through a formal cross-sector approach. Typically, this process involves an exchange of ideas and expertise and/or pooling of financial resources (Vernon, Essex, Pinder, & Curry, 2005). Yasarata, Altinay, Burns, and Okumus (2010) highlight how elite controlled networks and access to power lead to control of politicians who create a favourable investment climate policy that leads to planners implementing physical planning and activities. Collaboration involves the concept of power, social exchange theory and resource dependency (Jamal & Getz, 1995).

Relational approach

The relational approach emphasizes increased participation by ''stakeholders'' in the planning and operation of tourism organizations (Hall 2000). Long (2001) adopts an actor-oriented approach to examine agency, structures and social change. Bramwell (2006), and Bramwell and Myer (2007) adopt this actor oriented/relational approach to study power, policymaking, and related debates associated with tourism development. The later paper focuses on relations between actors and structures using an island in former East Germany as their case. Dredge (2006b) adopts a network to examine the development and delivery of policies.

Network approaches to policy development focus on ''policy communities'' made up of people who interact within networks. Here 'policy emerges as a result of informal patterns of association'' considering the dynamics of ''complex relationships'' by examining them ''as they shift and change'' (John, 1998, p. 1; Stevenson et al., 2008). Policy networks have, therefore, emerged as powerful organising perspectives to understand relational conceptions of policymaking (Wray, 2009). Networks have been used to examine environmental governance (Erkuş-Öztürk & Eraydin, 2010), interest groups in England (Tyler & Dinan, 2001), public-private partnerships, stakeholder's involvement and the role of networking and collective learning (Vernon et al., 2005). Denicolai, Cioccarelli and Zucchella (2010) interpret the tourism network approach by analysing four dimensions: knowledge sharing, formal agreements, degree of integration of local services, and trust. Scott, Cooper and Baggio (2008a) discusses the structure of networks. One feature of networks are bridging organizations (Jamal & Getz, 1995, p. 191), which span the social gaps among organizations

and constituencies to enable coordinated actions.

The concept of governance has been used to study regional institutions (Church, 2004; Church et al., 2000; Reed, 1997, p. 570; Timothy, 2003), decentralization in Turkey (Yuksel, Bramwell, & Yuksel, 2005), networks (Yuksel et al., 2005), develop principles of good governance (Eagles, 2009), and to examine protection of the public interest (D. Dredge & Thomas, 2009). Attempts to clarify types of governance include a typology of governance (Hall, 2011b), governance comparisons (Derco, 2012), and identification of governance archetypes (d'Angella, Carlo, & Sainaghi, 2010). Studies have examined governance for sustainable tourism development (Erkuş-Öztürk & Eraydın, 2010), complexity (Baggio, Scott, & Cooper, 2010a) and local governance (Beaumont & Dredge, 2010). In a neo-liberal world, boundaries are dissolving between public and private sectors and there is greater interdependency of actors in policymaking (Dianne Dredge & Jenkins, 2012). Two recent reviews of tourism governance are available (Ruhanen, Scott, Ritchie, & Tkaczynski, 2010; Zhang & Zhu, 2014).

Social capital, power, narratives and learning

A number of concepts from the social sciences have been applied in policy studies. Social capital refers to the bank of resources built up through interpersonal networks and associations upon which individual members of a community can draw. While there is some disagreement about the origin of the term 'social capital', there is no doubt that it is a concept which has gained prominence over the last decade. Social capital is about networks, about relationships and about reciprocity (Macbeth, Carson, & Northcote, 2004).

A number of studies aim to study who tourism power-holders are, the sources of their power, the values and interests that are served by the exercise of power (Church, 2004; Hannam, 2002). As Richter (1983, p. 318) writes 'tourism development, then, is a policy area only if political elites decide it will be'. Marzano and Scott (2009) examine the exercise of power in destination branding, while Church (2007) discusses the power of the military in Panama. Doorne (1998) argues that the study of power should be contextualised within particular environments and from particular perspectives, and acknowledges that there is no singular objective 'truth' in the analysis of politics, policies and power. Bianchi (2004) argues that the entrenched power of regional economic and political elites, is likely to undermine the prospects for a just model of sustainable tourism, and to consolidate inequalities across the

region. Findings of research by Airey and Ruhanen (2014) provide evidence for what Dredge (2011) describes as the industry capture of the policy space.

Attempts to influence growth policies have also examined their discourses, knowledge frameworks, and relative influence on the government (Bramwell, 2006). The precise agendas and discourses adopted by the various interest groups, amidst contemporary concerns about sustainability, would appear to be crucial to the success, or otherwise, of their arguments (Markwick, 2000). Cousin (2008) notes that the discourse of tourism has symbolic value and can act as a means of unifying elites. A recent strand of research has focused on policy analysis and learning in policy networks (Schianetz, Kavanagh, & Lockington, 2007), and identified three different types of learning: instrumental or technical, conceptual or social policy, and political (Hall, 2011a). A recent book examines knowledge management in tourism (Fayos-Sola, Da Silva, & Jafari, 2012).

METHODOLOGY FOR POLICY STUDIES

Compared to the theoretical discussion of policy, there is only a small methodological literature concerning tourism policy. There is some agreement that the study of tourism policy involves complexity, dynamism and change, and as a result Stevenson, Airey and Miller (2008) recommend the use of multiple approaches to understand policy making, and the use of grounded theory development. There is a need for awareness of the researcher's ideological beliefs and values as these may direct or constrain information sources, methodology, analysis, and findings.

The case-study approach is the predominant research strategy used in studies of tourism policy is and indeed Hall and Jenkins (1995) consider this overused. They recommend use of thick description to improve understanding of policy in a specific context rather than attempting to develop universal models. Such an approach can consider the wider political context within which decisions are made (Stevenson et al., 2008). Jenkins (1996) discusses interviewing and data collection for policy studies.

A number of methods have been used to examine tourism policy mainly concerning identifying and analyse the relationships and interactions between stakeholders. Stakeholder mapping considers these relationships as well as differing interests and powers, and has been used for planning strategies and establishing political priorities in terms of managing

stakeholder relationships (Markwick, 2000). Greenwood, Williams and Shaw (1990) discuss backward mapping as a data collection approach.

Social network analysis (SNA) methods are increasingly being adopted to study policy networks (Pforr, 2002). SNA involves collecting data concerning relationships between stakeholders (termed nodes). These are mapped using mathematical techniques with results displayed visually in network diagrams and network attributes quantitatively measured (Scott et al., 2008a; Scott, Cooper, & Baggio, 2008b). Such a quantitative approach has been criticised as positivist and ignoring the changing nature of relationships (Rhodes, 2002). SNA provides information on structural properties of the network as a whole that supplements the study of the relationships among individual stakeholders. A second differentiating characteristic is that it does not a priori define groups and structures within the destination (Scott et al., 2008a). Baggio, Scott, and Cooper (2010b) have further developed these methods and the techniques for the study of complex adaptive systems and provided an example of their application, the case of a tourism destination. Use of futures studies for developing longer term policies has also been recommended (Van Doorn, 1982).

CONCLUSIONS

This review of the study of tourism policy in tourism is based on the policy cycle as well as the analysis approach used. These two classificatory dimensions appear useful for seeking to integrate and synthesize a complex and fragmented literature. The review has highlighted the importance of the concept of development to tourism policy; in fact they are almost synonymous. The academic literature of tourism has over time moved from a simplistic view of tourism development based on contribution to central government macroeconomic policy to embrace sustainable development. It is arguable however that the practice of policy development in many countries has not followed the same pattern. Based on an examination of the literature, policy has been characterized as involving actions, decision, politics, values and ideological beliefs, social processes involving communication, outcomes such as legislation and implementation. Tourism policy involves collective action and how collective choices are made, implemented and enforced in and for a society (Buhrs, 2000).

It also appears that policy research has moved from particular political or ideological perspectives to a more sociological perspective looking at concepts like power, collaboration, and governance. Thus, generalist theories have been replaced with development of policy in

the context of local actors' power. That said tourism policy seems set within ideologies (mostly) with little questioning of boundaries. It seems to be about optimization of a particular approach or choice of policy options within a policy ideology. Additionally public tourism policy is increasingly seen as the study of parts of governments – rather than government as a whole.

Overall, we may conclude that contrary to the findings of Ballantyne, Packer, and Axelsen (2009) the tourism policy literature is not limited and indeed is a vibrant and active area for research. That said the tourism policy field does have area where improvements may be made. In particular, policy studies would benefit from comparative studies at a national or regional level. Some authors may say that such an approach ignores the complexity of policy contexts that frustrate comparisons between regions, countries or policy areas. However, it does appear that, for example, there is some commonality of policy instruments used around the world and thus comparison between their implementation and outcomes may prove useful, for examples in development of regions. Recently, there have been a number of such studies (Almeida García, 2014; Derco, 2012; OECD, 2012). In particular cross-country comparisons using examples of non-Western policy development may be useful. Certainly there is a need for monitoring and evaluation of policy after implementation (Bramwell & Lane, 2006). Policy evaluation studies are a possible short cut to information about the effects and efficiency of various specific interventions (Hjalager, 2010). A conclusion of some studies is that government tourism plans have little probability of influencing market forces to achieve economic success in destination areas and some indication of the effect of government policies would be extremely useful (Choy, 1991).

Areas for further research also include tourism laws - in countries such as Vietnam Cambodia and Laos – a tourism law is being developed and this holds interesting policy implications for its study. Perhaps there is a need for separate discussions about implications of industrialized and non-industrialized country destination planning, in that residents from the former have more flexibility in responding to development pressures than residents of the latter countries (Burns, 1999, p. 344).

A second developing areas found in the literature is the adoption and examination of the sociological perspective and concepts, such as the use of power (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Cheong & Miller, 2000), tourism policy networks, knowledge management (Cooper, 2006), tourism destinations as a commons (Ostrom, 1998, 2005) and especially the design

principles for robust management of common pool resources (Connelly, 2007; Haase et al., 2009). Hall and Jenkins (2004) suggest a need examination of the linkage between power, ideology, values, and institutions. Another area is the interaction of policy from other sectors on tourism, such as between terrorism and tourism (Richter & Waugh Jr, 1986). It would also be of interest to study the transfer of policy around the world and the role of various types of organizations in doing this (Hawkins & Mann, 2007).

Clearly the domain of sustainability is of critical importance but there is a need to distinguish between policy ideal and practice. For example Ioannides and Holcomb (2003, p. 40) consider that upmarket tourism an 'unrealistic long-term option for sustainable tourism development' and that there is a need to determine how to create sustainable tourism when it is dependent on an unsustainable transportation system. Policy research remains a critical area for further research.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Z. U., & Krohn, F. B. (1990). Reversing the United States declining competitiveness in the marketing of international tourism: a perspective on future policy. *Journal of Travel Research, 29*(2), 23-29.

Airey, D. (1983). European government approaches to tourism. *Tourism Management, 4*(4), 234-244.

Airey, D., & Chong, K. (2011). *Tourism in China: Policy and development since 1949*. London: Routledge.

Airey, D., & Ruhanen, L. (2014). Tourism Policy-Making in Australia: A National and State Perspective. *Tourism Planning & Development, 11*(2), 149-162.

Almeida García, F. (2014). A comparative study of the evolution of tourism policy in Spain and Portugal. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 11*, 34-50.

Altinay, L., & Bowen, D. (2006). Politics and tourism interface. The Case of Cyprus. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(4), 939-956.

Ambrosie, L. (2010). Tourism policy research: avenues for the future. *International Journal of Tourism Policy, 3*(1), 33-50.

Andriotis, K. (2001). Tourism planning and development in Crete: Recent tourism policies and their efficacy. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 9*(4), 298-316.

Aramberri, J., & Butler, R. (2005). *Tourism development: issues for a vulnerable industry*: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Araña, J. E., León, C. J., Moreno-Gil, S., & Zubiaurre, A. R. (2013). A Comparison of Tourists' Valuation of Climate Change Policy Using Different Pricing Frames. *Journal of Travel Research, 52*(1), 82-92. doi: 10.1177/0047287512457260

Azcairate, M. C. (2006). Between Local and Global, Discourses and Practices: Rethinking Ecotourism Development in Celestan (Yucatan, Mexico). *Journal of Ecotourism, 5*(1/2), 97-111.

Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010a). Improving tourism destination governance: a complexity science approach. *Tourism Review, 65*(4), 51-60.

Baggio, R., Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010b). Network science – a review with a focus on tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 37*(3), 802-827.

Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Axelsen, M. (2009). Trends in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(1), 149-152.

Baretje, R. (1982). Tourism's external account and the balance of payments. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(1), 57-67.

Beaumont, N., & Dredge, D. (2010). Local tourism governance: a comparison of three network approaches. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(1), 1-22.

Bhanugopan, R. (2001). Tourism development in Papua New Guinea: Strategies for success. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 6*(2), 65 - 73.

Bianchi, R. V. (2004). Tourism restructuring and the politics of sustainability: A critical view from the european periphery (The Canary Islands). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 12*(6), 495-529.

Blake, A., & Sinclair, M. T. (2003). Tourism crisis management - US response to September 11. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(4), 813-832.

Bramwell, B. (2006). Actors, power, and discourses of growth limits. *Annals of Tourism*

Research, 33(4), 957-978.

Bramwell, B., & Cox, V. (2009). Stage and path dependence approaches to the evolution of a national park tourism partnership. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(2), 191 - 206.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (1999). Collaboration and partnerships for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 7*(3/4), 179-181.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2006). Editorial: Policy Relevance and Sustainable Tourism Research: Liberal, Radical and Post-structuralist Perspectives. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 14*(1), 1-5.

Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2008). Priorities in Sustainable Tourism Research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*(1), 1 - 4.

Bramwell, B., & Meyer, D. (2007). Power and tourism policy relations in transition. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(3), 766-788.

Britton, S. (1982). The political economy of tourism in the third world. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(3), 331–358.

Buckley, R. (2009). Evaluating the net effects of ecotourism on the environment: a framework, first assessment and future research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(6), 643-672.

Buhalis, D. (2001). Tourism in Greece: Strategic analysis and challenges. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(5), 440-480.

Buhrs, T. (2000). The environment and the role of the state in New Zealand. In P. A. Memon & H. Perkins (Eds.), *Environmental Planning and Management in New Zealand* (pp. 27-35). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Bull, A. (1990). Australian tourism. Effects of foreign investment. *Tourism Management, 11*(4), 325-331.

Burns, P. (1999). Paradoxes in planning: Tourism Elitism or Brutalism? *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(2), 329-348.

Burns, P., & Novelli, M. (2008). *Tourism development: growth, myths, and inequalities*: CABI Publishing.

Cantallops, A. S. (2004). Policies supporting sustainable tourism development in the Balearic Islands: The Ecotax. *Anatolia, 15*(1), 39-56.

Castellani, V., & Sala, S. (2010). Sustainable performance index for tourism policy development. *Tourism Management, 31*(6), 871-880. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.10.001

Chambers, D., & Airey, D. (2001). Tourism Policy in Jamaica: A Tale of Two Governments. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 94-120.

Cheong, S.-M., & Miller, M. L. (2000). Power and tourism: A Foucauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(2), 371-390.

Choy, D. J. L. (1991). Tourism planning: The case for market failure. *Tourism Management, 12*(4), 313-330.

Church, A. (2004). Local and regional tourism: policy and power. In A. Lew, C. M. Hall & A. Williams (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 555-568). Oxford: Blackwell.

Church, A., Ball, R., Bull, C., & Tyler, D. (2000). Public policy engagement with British tourism: the national, local and the European Union. *Tourism Geographies, 2*(3), 312–336.

Church, A., & Coles, T. (2007). Tourism, power and space *Tourism, power and space*.

Cohen, E. (1988). Tourism and AIDS in Thailand. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(4), 467-486.

Colebatch, H. (2009). *Policy*. Maidenhead, UK.: McGraw-Hill.

Coles, T., Hall, C. M., & Duval, D. T. (2006). Tourism and Post-Disciplinary Enquiry. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*(4/5), 293-319.

Connelly, G. (2007). Testing Governance - A Research Agenda for Exploring Urban Tourism Competitiveness Policy: The Case of Liverpool 1980-2000. *Tourism Geographies, 9*(1), 84-114.

Cooper, C. (2006). Knowledge management and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(1), 47-64.

Cousin, S. (2008). The nation state as an identifying image. *Tourist Studies, 8*(2), 193-209.

Craik, J. (1990). A classic case of clientelism: The Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into travel and tourism. *Culture and Policy, 2*(1), 29-45.

d'Angella, F., Carlo, M. D., & Sainaghi, R. (2010). Archetypes of destination governance: a comparison of international destinations. *Tourism Review, 65*(4), 61-73.

Dahles, H. (2002). The politics of tour guiding: Image management in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(3), 783-800. doi: 10.1016/s0160-7383(01)00083

Deegan, J., & Dineen, D. A. (2000). Developments in Irish Tourism, 1980-96. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 2*(3), 163-170.

Denicolai, S., Cioccarelli, G., & Zucchella, A. (2010). Resource-based local development and networked core-competencies for tourism excellence. *Tourism Management, 31*(2), 260-266. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.03.002

Derco, J. (2012). Destination Governance in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland. *Tourism Planning & Development, 10*(3), 354-364. doi: 10.1080/21568316.2012.747987

Desforges, L. (2000). State tourism institutions and neo-liberal development: a case study of Peru. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment, 2*(2), 177 - 192.

Dieke, P. U. C. (1993). Tourism and development policy in the Gambia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(3), 423-449.

Dodds, R. (2007). Sustainable tourism and policy implementation: Lessons from the case of Calvia, Spain. *Current Issues in Tourism, 10*(4), 296-322.

Dodds, R., & Butler, R. (2010). Barriers To Implementing Sustainable Tourism Policy In Mass Tourism Destinations. *Tourismos, 5*(1), 35-54.

Doorne, S. (1998). Power, participation and perception: An insider's perspective on the politics of the Wellington waterfront redevelopment. *Current Issues in Tourism, 1*(2), 129-166.

Dredge, D. (2001). Local Government Tourism Planning and Policy-making in New South Wales: Institutional Development and Historical Legacies. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 355-.

Dredge, D. (2006a). Networks, Conflict and Collaborative Communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 14*(6), 562–581.

Dredge, D. (2006b). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management, 27*(2), 269-280.

Dredge, D. (2011). Tourism reform, policy and development in Queensland 1989–2011. *Queensland Review, 18*(2), 62–84.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2003). Federal-State relations and tourism public policy, New South Wales, Australia. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6*(5), 415-443.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2007). *Tourism Planning and Policy*. Brisbane: John Wiley and Sons.

Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2012). Australian National Tourism Policy: Influences of Reflexive and Political Modernisation. *Tourism Planning & Development, 9*(3), 231-251. doi: 10.1080/21568316.2012.678379

Dredge, D., & Thomas, P. (2009). Mongrel management, public interest and protected area management in the Victorian Alps, Australia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(2),

249-267.

Dubin, R. (1976). *Theory Building in Applied Areas*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.

Duffy, R. (2008). Neoliberalising Nature: Global Networks and Ecotourism Development in Madagasgar. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*(3), 327 - 344.

Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., & Spurr, R. (2004). Evaluating tourism's economic effects: New and old approaches. *Tourism Management, 25*(3), 307-317.

Dye, T. (1992). *Understanding Public Policy* (7th edn ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Eagles, P. (2009). Governance of recreation and tourism partnerships in parks and protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(2), 231-248.

Easton, D. (1953). *The Political System*. New York: Knopf.

Edgell, D. (1995). A barrier-free future for tourism? *Tourism Management, 16*(2), 107-110.

Elliott, J. (1997). *Tourism, Politics and Public Sector Management*. London: Routledge.

Erkuş-Öztürk, H., & Eraydin, A. (2010). Environmental governance for sustainable tourism development: Collaborative networks and organisation building in the Antalya tourism region. *Tourism Management, 31*(1), 113-124.

Erkuş-Öztürk, H., & Eraydın, A. (2010). Environmental governance for sustainable tourism development: Collaborative networks and organisation building in the Antalya tourism region. *Tourism Management, 31*(1), 113-124. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.002

Farrell, B., & Twining-Ward, L. (2004). Reconceptualizing tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(2), 274-295.

Farrell, B., & Twining-Ward, L. (2005). Seven steps towards sustainability: Tourism in the context of new knowledge. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 13*(2), 109-122.

Fayos-Sola, E. (1996). Tourism policy: a midsummer night's dream? *Tourism Management, 17*(6), 405-412.

Fayos-Sola, E., Da Silva, J. A. M., & Jafari, J. (2012). *Knowledge Management in Tourism: Policy and Governance Applications*: Emerald Group Publishing.

Fleischer, A., & Felsenstein, D. (2000). Support for rural tourism: Does it make a difference? *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(4), 1007-1024.

Franklin, A., & Crang, M. (2001). The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory? *Tourist Studies, 1*(1), 5-22.

Gartner, W. C. (2004). Rural Tourism Development in the USA. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 6*, 151–164.

Goldsworthy, D. (1988). Thinking politically about development. *Development and Change, 19*(3), 505-530.

Grant, M. (2004). Innovation in Tourism Planning Processes: Action Learning to Support a Coalition of Stakeholders for Sustainability. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development, 1*(3), 219–237.

Greenwood, J. (1992). Producer Interest Groups in Tourism Policy : Case Studies From Britain and the European Communit y. *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*(2), 36-256.

Greenwood, J., Williams, A. M., & Shaw, G. (1990). Policy implementation and tourism in the UK. Implications from recent tourism research in Cornwall. *Tourism Management, 11*(1), 53-62.

Haase, D., Lamers, M., & Amelung, B. (2009). Heading into uncharted territory? Exploring the institutional robustness of self-regulation in the Antarctic tourism sector. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(4), 411 - 430.

Hall, C. M. (1999). Rethinking Collaboration and Partnership: A Public Policy Perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 7*(3/4), 274-289.

Hall, C. M. (2000). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hall, C. M. (2002). Travel safety, terrorism and the media: The significance of the issue-attention cycle. *Current Issues in Tourism, 5*(5), 458-466.

Hall, C. M. (2007). Pro-Poor Tourism: Do "Tourism Exchanges Benefit Primarily the Countries of the South"? *Current Issues in Tourism, 10*(2&3), 111 - 118.

Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hall, C. M. (2011a). Policy learning and policy failure in sustainable tourism governance: from first- and second-order to third-order change? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*.

Hall, C. M. (2011b). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*.

Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (2004). Tourism and Public Policy. In A. Lew, C. M. Hall & A. Williams (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 425-540). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. M. (1995). *Tourism and Public Policy*: Routledge.

Hall, C. M., & Michael, E. J. (2007). Issues in regional development. In E. J. Michael (Ed.), *Micro-clusters and networks: The growth of tourism* (pp. 7-20). London: Elsevier.

Hannam, K. (2002). Tourism and development: globalisation and power. *Progress in Development Studies, 2*(3), 227-234.

Hannam, K. (2004). Tourism and Forest Management in India: The Role of the State in Limiting Tourism Development. *Tourism Geographies, 6*(3), 331-351.

Harrison, D., & Schipani, S. (2007). Lao Tourism and Poverty Alleviation: Community-Based Tourism and the Private Sector. *Current Issues in Tourism, 10*(2/3), 194-230.

Harvey, D. (2006). Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography, 88*(2), 145-158.

Hawkins, D., & Mann, S. (2007). The world bank's role in tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(2), 348-363.

Healy, R. G. (1994). The" common pool" problem in tourism landscapes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(3), 596-611.

Henderson, J. C. (2003). The politics of tourism in Myanmar. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6*(2), 97-118.

Henry, I. P., & Jackson, G. A. M. (1996). Sustainability of Management Processes and Tourism Products and Contexts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 4*(1), 17 - 28.

Hjalager, A. M. (2007). Stages in the economic globalization of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(2), 437-457.

Hjalager, A. M. (2010). A review of innovation research in tourism. *Tourism Management, 31*(1), 1-12.

Holden, A. (2003). In need of new environmental ethics for tourism? *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 94-108.

Holden, A. (2009). The environment-tourism nexus. Influence of Market Ethics *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(3), 373-389. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2008.10.0

Human, B. (1994). Visitor management in the public planning policy context: A case study of Cambridge. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 2*(4), 221 - 230.

Ioannides, D. (1995). A flawed implementation of sustainable tourism: the experience of Akamas, Cyprus. *Tourism Management, 16*(8), 583-592.

Ioannides, D., & Holcomb, B. (2003). Misguided policy initiatives in small-island destinations: why do up-market tourism policies fail? *Tourism Geographies, 5*(1), 39-48.

Jafari, J. (1989). An English-language literature review. In J. Bystrzanowski (Ed.), *Tourism as a factor of change: the sociocultural study* (pp. 17-60). Vienna: Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Sciences.

Jamal, T., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals*

of Tourism Research, 22(1), 186-204.

Jamal, T., & Getz, D. (1999). Community Roundtables for Tourism-related Conflicts: The Dialectics of Consensus and Process Structures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 7*(3), 290 - 313.

Jenkins, C. L., & Henry, B. M. (1982). Government involvement in tourism in developing countries. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(4), 499-521.

Jenkins, J. (1996). Interviews and Interviewing: a Case Study in Geography and Public Policy. *Australian Geographical Studies, 34*(2), 261-266.

Jenkins, J. (2001). Editorial. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2), 69 - 77.

John, P. (1998). *Analysing Public Policy*. London: Pinter.

Kent, M. (2006). From Reeds to Tourism: The Transformation of Territorial Conflicts in the Titicaca National Reserve. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*(1), 86 - 103.

Kerr, W. (2003). *Tourism Public Policy, and the strategic Management of Failure*. New York: Pergamon.

Kerr, W., Barron, G., & Wood, R. C. (2001). Politics, Policy And Regional Tourism Administration: A Case Examination Of Scottish Area Tourist Board Funding. *Tourism Management, 22*, 649-657.

Khadaroo, J., & Seetanah, B. (2007). Transport infrastructure and tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(4), 1021-1032.

Kousis, M. (2000). Tourism and the environment: a social movements perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(2), 468-489.

Kruczala, J. (1990). Tourism planning in Poland. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(1), 69-78.

Laing, J. H., Lee, D., Moore, S. A., Wegner, A., & Weiler, B. (2009). Advancing conceptual understanding of partnerships between protected area agencies and the tourism industry: a postdisciplinary and multi-theoretical approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(2), 207 - 229.

Lawrence, M., & Dredge, D. (2007). Tourism planning and policy processes. In D. Dredge & J. A. Jenkins (Eds.), *Tourism planning and policy* (pp. 191-224). Milton: John Wiley & Sons.

Lea, J. (1993). Tourism Development Ethics in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*, 701-715.

Lee, C. C., & Chang, C. P. (2008). Tourism development and economic growth: A closer look at panels. *Tourism Management, 29*(1), 180-192.

Lepp, A. (2008). Tourism and dependency: An analysis of Bigodi village, Uganda. *Tourism Management, 29*(6), 1206-1214.

Leslie, D., & Black, L. (2005). Tourism and the Impact of the Foot and Mouth Epidemic in the UK: Reactions, Responses and Realities with Particular Reference to Scotland. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 19*(2/3), 35-46.

Lindberg, K., Andersson, T. D., Dellaert, B. G. C., & Dellaert, B. G. C. (2001). Tourism Development: Assessing Social Gains And Losses. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*, 1010-1030.

Logar, I. (2010). Sustainable tourism management in Crikvenica, Croatia: An assessment of policy instruments. *Tourism Management, 31*(1), 125-135.

Long, N. (2001). *Development Sociology: Actor Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Lovelock, B. (2001). Interorganisational Relations in the Protected Area – Tourism Policy Domain: The Influence of Macro-economic Policy. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 253-274.

Lovelock, B. (2002). Why it's good to be bad: The role of conflict in contributing towards sustainable tourism in protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 10*(1), 5-30.

Lovelock, B. (2003). A comparative study of environmental NGOs' perspectives of the

tourism industry and modes of action in the South and South-East Asia and Oceania regions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 8*(1), 1-14.

Macbeth, J. (2005). Towards an ethics platform for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(4), 962-984.

Macbeth, J., Carson, D., & Northcote, J. (2004). Social Capital, Tourism and Regional Development: SPCC as a Basis for Innovation and Sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism, 7*(6), 502-522.

Macnaught, T. J. (1982). Mass tourism and the dilemmas of modernization in Pacific Island communities. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(3), 359-381.

Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 86-102.

Mair, H. (2006). Global restructuring and local responses: Investigating rural tourism policy in two Canadian communities. *Current Issues in Tourism, 9*(1), 1-45.

Markwick, M. C. (2000). Golf tourism development, stakeholders, differing discourses and alternative agendas: The case of Malta. *Tourism Management, 21*(5), 515-524.

Marzano, G., & Scott, N. (2009). Power in destination branding. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(2), 247–267.

Mathews, H. G. (1975). International Tourism and Political Science Research. *Annals of Tourism Research, 2*(4), 195-203.

Matthews, H. G., & Richter, L. K. (1991). Political science and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 18*(1), 120-135.

McCoy, P. (1982). The new national tourism policy act the state role in implementation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(2), 276-279.

McDonald, J. R. (2009). Complexity science: an alternative world view for understanding sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(4), 455 - 471.

Michael, E. J. (2001). Public Choice and Tourism Analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 308-330.

Molotch, H. (1976). The city as growth machine. *American Journal of Sociology, 82*(3), 483-499.

Mortazavi, R. (1997). The right of public access in Sweden. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(3), 609-623.

Mosedale, J. (2011). Re-introducing tourism to political economy. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism. A critical perspective* (pp. 1-13). London: Routledge.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Metheun.

Nilsson, P. A. (2001). Tourist Destination Development: The Are Valley. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 1*(1), 54-67.

O'Fallon, C. (1993). Government involvement in New Zealand tourism: A public choice perspective. *GeoJournal, 29*(3), 271-280.

O'Neil, P. (2007). *Essentials of Comparative Politics* (2nd ed.): Norton.

Odularu, G. O. (2008). Does Tourism Contribute to Economic Performance in West Africa? *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Research, 19*(2), 340-345.

OECD. (2012). Tourism governance in OECD countries. In OECD (Ed.), *OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 2012*. Paris: OECD.

Olds, K. (1998). Urban mega-events, evictions and housing rights: The Canadian case. *Current Issues in Tourism, 1*(1), 2-46.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1998). A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action. *The American Political Science Review, 92*(1), 1-22.

Ostrom, E. (2005). *Understanding institutional diversity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pearce, D. G. (1998). Tourism development in Paris: public intervention. *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(2), 457-476.

Pearce, D. G. (2001). Tourism, trams and local government policy-making in Christchurch, New Zealand. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 331-354.

Pearlman, M. V. (1990). Conflicts and constraints in Bulgaria's tourism sector. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(1), 103-122.

Pforr, C. (2001). Tourism Policy in Australia's Northern Territory: A Policy Process Analysis of its Tourism Development Masterplan. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 275-307.

Pforr, C. (2002). The 'makers and shapers' of tourism policy in the Northern Territory of Australia: A policy network analysis of actors and their relational constellations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 9*(2), 134-151.

Pforr, C. (2005). Three lenses of analysis for the study of tourism public policy: a case from Northern Australia. *Current Issues in Tourism, 8*(4), 323-343.

Pham, T. D., Dwyer, L., & Spurr, R. A. Y. (2009). Constructing a regional tourism satellite account: The case of Queensland. *Tourism Analysis, 13*(5/6), 445-460.

Prunier, E. K., Sweeney, A. E., & Geen, A. G. (1993). Tourism and the environment: the case of Zakynthos. *Tourism Management, 14*(2), 137-141.

Puppim de Oliveira, J. A. (2003). Governmental responses to tourism development: three Brazilian case studies. *Tourism Management, 24*(1), 97.

Reed, M. G. (1997). Power relations and community based tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(3), 566-591.

Reid, M., & Schwab, W. (2006). Barriers to Sustainable Development: Jordan's Sustainable Tourism Strategy. *Journal of Asian & African Studies, 41*(4), 439-457.

Rhodes, R. (2002). Putting People Back into Networks. *Australian Journal of Political Science, 37*(3), 399–416.

Richter, L. (1983). Tourism politics and political science : A case of not so benign neglect. *Annals of Tourism Research, 10*(3), 313-335.

Richter, L. (2003). International tourism and its global public health consequences. *Journal of Travel Research, 41*(4), 340-347.

Richter, L., & Richter, W. (1985). Policy choices in South Asian tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 12*(2), 201-217.

Richter, L., & Waugh Jr, W. L. (1986). Terrorism and tourism as logical companions. *Tourism Management, 7*(4), 230-238.

Ritchie, B., Crotts, J. C., Zehrer, A., & Volsky, G. T. (2014). Understanding the Effects of a Tourism Crisis: The Impact of the BP Oil Spill on Regional Lodging Demand. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(1), 12-25. doi: 10.1177/0047287513482775

Ritchie, J. R. B. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism. Measuring resident views via survey research. *Tourism Management, 9*(3), 199-212.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. I. (2000). The competitive destination: A sustainability perspective. *Tourism Management, 21*(1), 1-7.

Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003). *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*: CABI.

Rittel, H., & Weber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*(2), 155-169.

Rosentraub, M. S., & Joo, M. (2009). Tourism and economic development: Which investments produce gains for regions? *Tourism Management, 30*(5), 759-770.

Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Tourism Review, 65*(4), 4-16.

Russo, A. P., & Segre, G. (2009). Destination models and property regimes: An exploration. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(4), 587-606.

Schianetz, K., Kavanagh, L., & Lockington, D. (2007). The Learning Tourism Destination: The potential of a learning organisation approach for improving the sustainability of tourism destinations. *Tourism Management, 28*(6), 1485-1496.

Scott, N., Cooper, C., & Baggio, R. (2008a). Destination Networks: Four Australian Cases. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(1), 169–188.

Scott, N., Cooper, C., & Baggio, R. (2008b). *Network Analysis and Tourism: From Theory to Practice*. London: Multilingual Matters & Channel View Publications.

Sessa, A. (1976). The Tourism Policy. *Annals of Tourism Research, 3*(5), 234-247.

Sharpley, R. (2009). Tourism and development challenges in the least developed countries: The case of The Gambia. *Current Issues in Tourism, 12*(4), 337-358.

Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. J. (2002). *Tourism and Development : Concepts and Issues*. Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Shone, M. C., & Ali Memon, P. (2008). Tourism, public policy and regional development: A turn from neo-liberalism to the new regionalism. *Local Economy, 23*(4), 290-304.

Smeral, E. (1998). The impact of globalization on small and medium enterprises: new challenges for tourism policies in European countries. *Tourism Management, 19*(4), 371-380.

Smyth, R. (1986). Public policy for tourism in Northern Ireland. *Tourism Management, 7*(2), 120-126.

Sofield, T. H. B. (1993). Indigenous tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(4), 729-750.

Steiner, C. (2006). Tourism, Poverty Reduction and the Political Economy: Egyptian Perspectives on Tourism's Economic Benefits in a Semi-"Rentier" State. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development, 3*(3), 161 - 177.

Stevenson, N., Airey, D., & Miller, G. (2008). Tourism Policy Making: The Policymakers' Perspectives. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(3), 732-750.

Stone, C. (1989). *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta 1946-1988*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Sugiyarto, G., Blake, A., & Sinclair, M. T. (2003). Tourism and globalization: Economic Impact in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(3), 683-701.

Swain, M., Brent, M., & Long, V. (1999). Annals and Tourism Evolving: Indexing 25 years of publication. *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(Index to Volume 25), 991-1014.

Telfer, D. (2002). The evolution of tourism and development theory. In R. Sharpley & D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development: concepts and issues* (pp. 35–78). Clevedon: Channel View.

Telfer, D., & Sharpley, R. (2008). *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. London: Routledge.

Teye, V. (1988). Geographic factors affecting tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(4), 487-503.

Thomas, H., & Thomas, R. (1998). The implications for tourism of shifts in British local governance. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research, 4*(4), 295-306.

Thyne, M., & Lawson, R. (2001). Addressing tourism public policy issues through attitude segmentation of host communities. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 392-400.

Timothy, D. (2003). Supranationalist Alliances and Tourism: Insights from ASEAN and SAARC. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6*(3), 250-266.

Tosun, C. (2001). Challenges Of Sustainable Tourism Development In The Developing World: The Case Of Turkey. *Tourism Management, 22*, 289-303.

Tovar, C., & Lockwood, M. (2008). Social impacts of tourism: an Australian regional case

study. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 10*(4), 365-378.

Treuren, G., & Lane, D. (2003). The Tourism Planning Process in the Context of Organised Interests, Industry Structure, State Capacity, Accumulation and Sustainability. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6*(1), 1-22.

Tsartas, P. (2003). Tourism Development in Greek Insular and Coastal Areas: Sociocultural Changes and Crucial Policy Issues. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 11*(2), 116-132.

Turegano, M. Ã. S. (2006). Dependency and development patterns in tourism: A case study in the Canary Islands. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development, 3*(2), 117 - 130.

Tyler, D., & Dinan, C. (2001). The role of interested groups in England's emerging tourism policy network. *Current Issues in Tourism, 4*(2-4), 210-252.

Van Doorn, J. W. M. (1982). Can Futures Research Contribute to Tourism Policy. *Tourism Management, 3*(3), 149-166.

Veal, A. J. (2002). *Leisure and Tourism Policy and Planning*. Wallingford, Oxon: CABI Publishing.

Vernon, J., Essex, S., Pinder, D., & Curry, K. (2005). Collaborative policymaking: local sustainable projects. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(2), 325-345.

Wanhill, S. (1987). UK: politics and tourism. *Tourism Management, 8*(1), 54-58.

Ward, T. (1989). The role of government incentives. *Tourism Management, 10*(3), 240-241.

Weaver, D. B. (1995). Alternative tourism in Montserrat. *Tourism Management, 16*(8), 593-604.

Weaver, D. B. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Milton, Queensland: John Wiley & Sons.

Weed, M. (2006). The Influence of Policy Makers' Perceptions on Sport Tourism Policy Development. *Tourism Review International, 10*(4), 227-240.

Wheatcroft, S. (1988). European air transport in the 1990s. *Tourism Management, 9*(3), 187-198.

Whitford, M. (2009). A framework for the development of event public policy: Facilitating regional development. *Tourism Management, 30*(5), 674-682.

Wight, P. A. (2002). Supporting the Principles of Sustainable Development in Tourism and Ecotourism: Government's Potential Role. *Current Issues in Tourism, 5*(3), 222 - 244.

Wilkinson, P. (2001). Tourism development in Anguilla. *Tourism Recreation Research, 26*(3), 33-41.

Williams, C., & Ferguson, M. (2005). Biting the Hand that Feeds: The Marginalisation of Tourism and Leisure Industry Providers in Times of Agricultural Crisis. *Current Issues in Tourism, 8*(2), 155 - 164.

Wray, M. (2009). Policy communities, networks and issue cycles in tourism destination systems. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(6), 673-690.

Yasarata, M., Altinay, L., Burns, P., & Okumus, F. (2010). Politics and sustainable tourism development - Can they co-exist? Voices from North Cyprus. *Tourism Management, 31*, 345-356.

York, Q. Y., & Zhang, H. Q. (2010). The determinants of the 1999 and 2007 Chinese Golden Holiday System: A content analysis of official documentation. *Tourism Management, 31*(6), 881-890. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.10.003

Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yuksel, A. (2005). Centralized and decentralized tourism governance in Turkey. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(4), 859-886.

Zahra, A., & Ryan, C. (2005). National Tourism Organisations -- Politics, Functions and Form: A New Zealand Case Study. *Anatolia, 16*(1), 5-26.

Zeng, B., Carter, R. W., & De Lacy, T. (2005). Short-term perturbations and tourism effects: The case of SARS in China. *Current Issues in Tourism, 8*(4), 306-322.

Zhang, H., & Zhu, M. (2014). Tourism Destination Governance: A Review and Research

Agenda. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning, 4*(2), 125-128.